

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

		,			MK
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR			ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/895,950	07/17/97	WINTER		Α	H0E-90/F-333
			\neg		EXAMINER
		IM52/0306			
CONNOLLY AND HUTZ				TESKIN	
1220 MARKET	STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
PO BOX 2207					19
WILMINGTON	DE 19899			1713	~ /
				DATE MAILED:	
					03/06/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No. 08/895,950

Applicant(s)

Winter, et al.

Examiner

Fred Teskin

Group Art Unit 1713



X Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>January 2 and January 24,</u>	2001 .
This action is FINAL .	
Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 1	
A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respoapplication to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of times of the second s	nd within the period for response will cause the
Disposition of Claims	
	is/are pending in the application.
Of the above, claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from consideration.
☐ Claim(s)	
Claim(s)	
☐ Claims are	
	•
Application Papers	v, PTO-948.
☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are objected to by	
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on is	
☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.	
☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	
☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 3	5 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the price	
☐ received.	
☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number)	·
\square received in this national stage application from the Internat	ional Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
*Certified copies not received:	
☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under	35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
Attachment(s)	
☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892	
☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s).	
☑ Interview Summary, PTO-413	
 □ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948 □ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152 	
_ Notice of informal ratent Application, 110-102	
·	

- 1. The finality of the Office action of August 24, 2000 is hereby withdrawn and prosecution reopened so that new grounds of rejection, as detailed below, may be entered.
- 2. The amendments filed January 2 and January 24, 2001 propose amendments to claims 1, 19, 25 and 26 that do not comply with 37 CFR 1.121(b), which sets forth the manner of making amendments in reissue applications. Specifically, the amendment to claim 1 removes the second occurrence of "a halogen atom" in the definition of R⁴ by using brackets. The second occurrence of this term was, however, already deleted by certificate of correction for the original patent; therefore, such amendment is unnecessary. In addition, claims 19, 25 and 26 include bracketing but none of said claims was present in the original patent. As all amendments to the claims are made vis-a-vis the patent claims, claims 25 and 26 should only be underlined and all bracketed matter simply omitted, with an explanation for the deletions provided in the remarks.

Applicants are required to correctly amend the reissue application in the response to this Office action.

3. With respect to the assent of assignee filed December 4, 1997, it is noted that the assignee of the patent for which reissue is sought has changed; according to Office records, the new assignee

is Targor GMBH. Accordingly, a new assent of assignee complying with the requirements of 37 CFR 1.172 and 3.73(b) is required.

4. Claims 19-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 19 [and claims dependent thereon] is indefinite due to lack of definition for variable "p" in formula (I). Note that the definition of "p" was deleted from claim 19 by the amendment of January 24, 2001, but the variable still appears in the underlined formula. Appropriate correction is required.

5. Claims 21-24 are rejected under 35 USC 251 for lack of error in obtaining the original patent.

Claims 21 and 22 are drawn to a catalyst composition; however, in the patent file, claim 8, also drawn to a catalyst composition, was subject to restriction (see the action of January 13, 1992) and later cancelled to place the application in condition for allowance. No divisional application was filed claiming the subject matter cancelled from the patent file. The failure to timely file a divisional application is not an error correctable by reissue of the original patent. See MPEP 1450.

Claims 1-16 and 19-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 251 as being an improper recapture of broadened claimed subject matter surrendered in the application for the patent upon which the present reissue is based. See Hester Industries, Inc. v. Stein, Inc., 142 F.3d 1472, 46 USPQ2d 1641 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Clement, 131 F.3d 1464, 45 USPQ2d 1161 (Fed. Cir. 1997); Ball Corp. v. United States, 729 F.2d 1429, 1436, 221 USPQ 289, 295 (Fed. Cir. 1984). A broadening aspect is present in the reissue which was not The record of the present in the application for patent. application for the patent shows that the broadening aspect (in the reissue) relates to subject matter that applicant previously during the prosecution of the surrendered application. Accordingly, the narrow scope of the claims in the patent was not an error within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 251, and the broader scope surrendered in the application for the patent cannot be recaptured by the filing of the present reissue application.

In the original patent application, the limitation of "for preparing essentially isotactic olefin polymers" was inserted into claim 1 to distinguish the claims over the prior art. See the Amendment of September 25, 1992, page 4, where a prior art rejection was traversed in part by arguing that the aforenoted phrase "acts as a limitation and defines the scope of the invention". Note also the Declaration of May 18, 1993, wherein it

is stated that the polymers prepared in accordance with the present invention exhibit a significantly higher isotacticity. Deletion of this limitation from the claims of this reissue application is therefore deemed to engender impermissable recapture of surrendered subject matter. See MPEP 1412.02 in this regard.

- 7. Applicant is reminded that any subsequent amendment to the specification and/or claims must comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.121(b) and that correction of additional errors that are not merely spelling, grammar, typographical, editorial or clerical errors will require a supplemental oath or declaration complying with 37 CFR 1.175(b)(1). See In re Constant, 3 USPQ2d 1479.
- 8. In view of the new grounds of rejection *supra*, this action is made non-final.
- 9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner F. M. Teskin whose telephone number is (703) 308-2456.
- If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wu, can be reached on (703) 308-2450. The appropriate fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-3599.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

FRED TESKING PATENT EXAMING ART UNIT 1913

FMTeskin/03-01-01